

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the subject application. After entry of the above amendments to the claims, claims 1-20 have been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection of the claims in view of the above amendments and remarks as set forth herein below.

1. Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claims have been amended in response to the Examiner's comments.

2. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Phelps (U.S. 5,033,964). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Phelps discloses "a removable card, 4A, with Braille or large print representations thereon corresponding to the text of page 3."

The Braille depicted on the removable card 4A is not Braille type bar code according to the claimed combination. Thus, Phelps does not anticipate the claimed invention.

3. Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bail (G.B. 2184588) in view of Phelps. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Phelps is discussed above. Bail discloses a portable reading system for the visually handicapped including a hand held device for scanning bar codes and means for converting the output of the device into synthesized speech. Further, Bail discloses that the “bar codes are arranged in linear arrays (figure 3-not shown) to facilitate scanning. Guiding devices to help the scanning device move over the arrays may be provided, as may tactile indications of the positions of the arrays.” (See abstract).

The bar code shown in diagrams 2 and 3 are one (1) dimensional bar codes, not two (2) dimensional matrix type bar codes according to the present invention. Specifically, the bar codes disclosed by Bail are read in one (1) dimension by a scanner whereas the two (2) dimensional and three (3) dimensional matrix type bar codes according to the present invention are scanned simultaneously in two dimensions and three dimensions as the scanner device is moved along the bar code.

It is pointed out that the bar code shown in diagram 3 of Bail initially may appear to be a two (2) dimensional bar code, but instead this bar code is defined by multiple one (1) dimensional bar codes connected together vertically and touching each other based on the description at page 1, lines 100-102, and further described at page 1, line 96 to page 2, lines 28. The bar code shown in diagram 3 of Bail is read left to right along rows with the hand held scanner being moved down the page in increments D to begin reading left to right of the next row of one (1) dimensional bar code. In conclusion, both Phelps and Bail do not disclose an at least two (2) dimensional matrix type bar code according to the claimed combination, and thus Phelps and Bail alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 2, it is noted that Bail discloses using the spine of a bound document to located the start position of each row of bar code (as disclosed at page 2, line 29 to line 65). Thus, the spine of the bound document is used to locate the start position of a row of one (1) dimensional bar code, and the spine or edge of the page is not used to guide the scanning head along the length of the bar code, let alone a two (2) dimensional matrix type bar code according to the claimed combination. Specifically, once the bar code scanner of Bail is placed at the spine it is moved left to right by the user and is no longer guided by the spine or the edge of the page and relies on the accuracy of free hand movement. Thus, Bail discusses the use of other document holders or templates at page 2, lines 47-65 to aid in the movement of the user's hand from left to right versus free hand movement. Thus, claim 2 further limits independent claim 1 in a manner even further unlike the disclosure of Bail, and again like claim 1 is not suggested by Phelps and/or Bail.

It is important to note that the use of two (2) dimensional and three (3) dimensional matrix type bar code according to the claimed combination allows for a much higher or dense information content versus the one (1) dimensional bar code disclosed by Bail. By using a two (2) dimensional matrix type bar code, a single line of bar code along the inner margin shown in Figure 5 of the present application has the ability to store the same or more information content than the printed matter printed on the same page. In comparison with the bar code shown in diagram 3 of Bail, the bar code requires multiple scanning left to right through eleven (11) lines of one (1) dimensional bar codes to have the same information content as a page of printed matter. Further, the bar code shown in diagram 3 of Bail may take up most of or the entire page

due to the limited information content of one (1) dimensional bar code leaving no room or not enough room for printed matter on the same page. Please note that diagram 3 of Bail shows no printed matter, but just the bar code. Thus, this is further evidence that the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art cited, or that of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

It is not believed that an Extension of Time is required, however, in the event that an Extension of Time is necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such Extension of Time as necessary are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 11-1243.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 11-1243.

Respectfully submitted

KLIMA LAW OFFICES, P.L.L.C.



William L. Klima
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,422

Date: March 7, 2005
P. O. Box 2855
Stafford, VA 22555-2855
(540) 657-9344